

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-36 are currently pending in this application. Of these, claims 10-18 are allowed. Claims 1, 19, 24, and 29 are amended. New claim 37 is added. Also, claims 20-23 and 34-36 are canceled. Thus, upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-19, 24-33, and 37 will be pending. Applicants believe that these changes do not add new matter. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-9 and 19-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,065,137 to Herman ("Herman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,894,614 to Eckstein et al. ("Eckstein"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 19 and 29 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in allowed claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants assert that these claims and their corresponding dependent claims are patentable.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "wherein the first planarized coil and the second planarized coil overlap partially." Applicants assert that this feature is neither taught nor suggested by Herman and Eckstein.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Herman shows coils that are "aligned and overlapping directly." More particularly, Herman discloses coils L1 and L2 that are aligned such that a linear core 12 extends into the center of both coils L1 and L2. However, Herman fails to disclose or suggest a partial overlapping of coils, as recited in amended claim 1. Eckstein fails to overcome this deficiency. Therefore, Applicants assert that claim 1, as well as its dependent claims 2-9, are patentable over Herman in view of Eckstein.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

IV. New Claims

New claim 37 is directed to a method, recites features similar to those recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants assert that this claim is patentable over Herman in view of Eckstein for at least the reasons set forth above.

V. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. However, Applicants hereby reserve the right to make additional arguments regarding distinctions between the claims and the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

s/John A. Harroun/s
John A. Harroun, Reg. No. 46,339
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: November 27, 2006

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102
Wexford, PA 15090
(724) 933-5529